

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 23, 2006. Claims 1, 4 to 6, 12, 15 to 17, 23, 26 and 29 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 12, 23, 26 and 29 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that Claims 3 and 14 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Furthermore, Applicant notes that the Restriction Requirement dated November 15, 2004 listed the claims in provisionally elected Group I as "1, 3-6, 14-**17**, 23, 26, and 29". However, in the present Office Action, the claims of provisionally elected Group 1 were indicated as "1, 3-6, 14-**18**, 23, 26, and 29." Applicant has addressed the claims of provisionally elected Group I, namely Claims 1, 3-6, 14 to **17**, 23, 26 and 29 in the present Amendment as Applicant believes that was the Examiner's intent.

Claims 1, 4 to 6, 12, 15 and 16 were objected to for various informalities. The Examiner's recommended amendments having been made herein, withdrawal of the objection to Claims 1, 4 to 6, 12, 15 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 12, 17 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly being based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Without conceding the correctness of the rejections, Claims 1, 12, 17 and 26 have been amended herein to clarify that it is the data **copied** from the first database into the second database by the first copying step whose attributes are being manipulated in the second database.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-patentable subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has amended Claim 29 to clarify that it is directed to a computer-readable storage medium which stores a computer-executable control program for a database client. Applicant understands this to be consistent with the USPTO's current guidelines regarding computer-related inventions. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1 and 23 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 3, which was dependent solely from Claim 1, and Claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 23 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 12, 26 and 29 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 14, which was dependent solely from Claim 12, and Claim 14 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 12, 26 and 29 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of

the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.